

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

LG.PHILIPS LCD CO., LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

C.A. NO. 04-343 (JJF)

TATUNG CO.;
TATUNG COMPANY OF AMERICA, INC.; AND
VIEWSONIC CORPORATION,

Defendants.

ORDER

This ____ day of March, 2007, having considered the Parties' submissions and argument from counsel relating to **ViewSonic's Motion for a Protective Order to Circumscribe the Scope of Topics for Which ViewSonic Must Produce a Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) Witness**, and it appearing to this Court that there is good cause for the granting of such Motion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that ViewSonic's Motion is **GRANTED** as follows:

1. ViewSonic shall not be required to produce a 30(b)(6) witness on LPL's Topic No. 1 contained in LPL's Supplemental Notice of Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition to ViewSonic Corporation;

2. All topics in the deposition notice served on ViewSonic by LPL shall be circumscribed to prevent inquiry into issues related to claim terms and ViewSonic shall not be required to produce a 30(b)(6) witness on LPL's Topic No. 5 nor as to those parts of Topic Nos.

1, 27 and 29 that relate to claim terms because these topics are directed to disputed claim terms and/or the claims of the patents in suit before the issuance of a *Markman* opinion in this action;

3. ViewSonic shall not be required to produce a 30(b)(6) witness on LPL's Topic Nos. 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 23 because these topics prematurely seek discovery related to legal conclusions and expert testimony;

4. ViewSonic shall not be required to produce a 30(b)(6) witness to provide information relating to infringement and damages for any topic which pre-dates May 28, 2004, the date that ViewSonic first had knowledge of the patents in suit.

5. ViewSonic shall not be required to produce a 30(b)(6) witness on LPL's Topic Nos. 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 25 and 29 to the extent such topics are directed to establishing inducing infringement.

SO ORDERED.

Vincent J. Poppiti
Special Master

525676